arXiv:hep-ph/0609118v1 12 Sep 2006

BARYONS AND LARGE N_c IN HAPPY RESONANCE

R.F. LEBED*

Department of Physics, Arizona State University,
Tempe, AZ 85287-1504, USA
** E-mail: richard.lebed@asu.edu*

I discuss recent developments in the large N_c treatment of unstable baryon resonances and the scattering amplitudes in which they appear. These include pion photoproduction, extension to three-flavor processes, decoupling of large N_c artifacts, and combination of this approach with results of chiral symmetry.

1. Introduction

At the time of this writing, the 2006 *Review of Particle Physics*[1] has just landed on my desk. Of this tome's 1232 pages, almost 10% list properties of baryon resonances. And yet, no consistent picture has yet been developed that predicts their rich spectroscopy with any degree of accuracy and consistency. Quark models accommodate a number of observed multiplets but predict numerous others unsupported by experimental evidence, while treating resonances as meson-baryon bound states explains some of the resonant branching fractions but fails to reproduce the multiplet structure. Both of these approaches derive from the underlying QCD theory only by employing heuristic arguments that are often obscure. And lattice gauge theory, while not suffering this ambiguity, has far to develop before it will be able to take on such an intricate tangle of unstable states.

Since the beginning of 2002, Tom Cohen and I have been developing a method[2–13] that treats unstable baryon resonances consistently in the $1/N_c$ expansion of QCD as broad, unstable states [masses lying $O(N_c^0)$ above the ground-state baryons of mass $O(N_c^1)$, and widths of $O(N_c^0)$]. The $1/N_c$ expansion is a well-defined field-theoretical limit of QCD-like theories (specifically, QCD with N_c rather than 3 colors) and therefore escapes the criticisms of the previous paragraph. On the other hand, in its basic form the $1/N_c$ expansion tells only how to count powers of $1/N_c$ and does not by itself provide a means of computing dynamical quantities. Even so, it provides

an organizing principle of remarkable power,[14] especially for baryons.

This formalism has been outlined in a number of earlier conference proceedings,[15,16] the first of which was the preceding installment of this CAQCD series.[15] Since space here is limited, I provide only a sketchy description of the origin of the method in Sec. 2 and refer the interested reader to the prior write-ups for more detail, and in Sec. 3 summarize findings since the last CAQCD conference.[7–13]

2. The Scattering Method

Chiral soliton models, particularly the Skyrme model, achieved a degree of fashionability in the early to mid-1980's, owing to a series of papers[17] discussing their topological character and connection to large N_c. Prominent in this era were a number of works noting the model independence of a number of their predictions, particularly linear relations between meson-baryon scattering amplitudes (*e.g.*, $S_{11} = S_{31}$).[18,19] As gradually became clear, these results are consequences of an underlying symmetry imposed by the soliton's hedgehog configuration, which is characterized by the quantum number K, where $\mathbf{K} \equiv \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{J}$; the scattering amplitudes, labeled by good I and J quantum numbers, are then obtained by forming linear combinations of the K-labeled amplitudes in an exercise of "Clebschology."

Subsequently it was recognized that the underlying K conservation can be expressed, via crossing from the s channel to the t channel, in terms of the rule $I_t = J_t$.[20,21] Nevertheless, the connection of these results to large N_c depended upon identifying the hedgehog configuration and its excitations with this limit; it is certainly a reasonable approach, because the ground-state baryons are built from the hedgehog, which exhibits the maximal symmetry between I and J characterizing the ground-state baryons. Nevertheless, to see true compatibility with large N_c one needs a formalism that studies real meson-baryon scattering in the large N_c limit; this is provided by the consistency condition approach developed in the early 1990's.[22] One offshoot of this program[23] showed the $I_t = J_t$ rule to be an immediate consequence, and moreover that amplitudes with $|I_t - J_t| = n$ are suppressed by at least $1/N_c^n$. The pieces were then in place to show that 1) the old linear amplitude relations based on K are true large N_c results,[2] 2) the relations apply also to the baryon resonances embedded in these amplitudes,[2] and 3) $O(1/N_c^n)$ corrections can be incorporated[6] by including suppressed amplitudes with $|I_t - J_t| = n$. Moreover, while the ground-state band of baryons, $I = J = \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, \ldots$, in the naive quark and chiral soliton pictures for large N_c is the same, the irreducible excited baryon multiplets of the

quark picture turn out to be reducible collections of multiplets labeled by K ("compatibility").[3] The underlying K conservation leads to a predictive pattern[2] of allowed and forbidden decays [explaining, *e.g.*, the dominance of the ηN decay of $N(1535)$, since the $K{=}0$ pole in the $I{=}J{=}\frac{1}{2}$ negative-parity channel couples only to ηN], tells what types of resonant multiplets are allowed,[2,3,5] and respects the broadness of resonances and configuration mixing between resonances of the same quantum numbers.[4]

3. New Developments

Pion Photoproduction. The same approach that applies to meson-baryon scattering may be employed as well for other cases of physical interest. As long as the quantum numbers and $1/N_c$ suppressions of the fields coupling to the baryon are known, the same methods apply. Here one has in mind such processes as photoproduction,[8] electroproduction, or real or virtual Compton scattering. Photons, for example, carry both isovector and isoscalar quantum numbers, the former dominating[24] in baryon couplings by a factor of N_c. Amplitudes that include the leading [relative $O(N_c^0)$] and first subleading [$O(1/N_c)$] isovector and the leading [$O(1/N_c)$] isoscalar amplitudes then produces linear relations among multipole amplitudes with relative $O(1/N_c^2)$ corrections.[8] While the relations obtained this way that reflect the dominance of isovector over isoscalar amplitudes agree quite impressively with data (*i.e.*, the amplitudes have the same shape as functions of photon energy), a number of other relations, particularly for magnetic multipoles, superficially appear to fare badly. However, in those cases the threshold behaviors still agree quite well, followed by seemingly divergent behavior in the respective resonant regions. These discrepancies appear to be due to the slightly different placement [at $O(\Lambda_{\rm QCD}/N_c) = O(100\,{\rm MeV})$] of resonances that are degenerate in the large N_c limit but with different I, J values. When a comparison of the amplitude relations is performed by taking *on-resonance* couplings[1], the linear relations good to $O(1/N_c^2)$ do indeed produce agreement to within about 1 part in 9.[8]

Three Flavors. The work summarized in the previous section all referred to systems either containing only u and d quarks, or those in which any heavier quarks are inert spectators. In nature, however, there appears to be some evidence that not only the baryon ground-state band but resonances as well exhibit a degree of SU(3) flavor symmetry. The first task in such analysis in the $1/N_c$ expansion is to have the group theory under control, which requires tables of SU(3) Clebsch-Gordan coefficients

(CGC) as functions of N_c; the standard ladder operator methods may be employed to derive them.[7] Since baryons at large N_c have the quantum numbers of N_c quarks, their SU(3) representations are much larger than for $N_c=3$; for example, the analogue to the 3-color, 3-flavor octet is called "**8**": $(p,q)=[1,\frac{1}{2}(N_c-1)]$, which has $O(N_c^2)$ states. One finds that the linear amplitude relations connecting resonances of different I and J for two flavors contain SU(3) CGC in the 3-flavor case, and therefore link together members of distinct SU(3) multiplets with various J values.[9] Such a phenomenon is known from chiral soliton models, and occurs for the same reason: The group theory is inherited from large N_c! Once a single resonance is found and its quantum numbers are measured, large N_c tells what other states of different J, I, and strangeness should be degenerate to $O(\Lambda_{\rm QCD}/N_c)=O(100\,{\rm MeV})$ [not counting the additive $\sim$150 MeV contribution for each s-quark] in both mass and width. This is a very useful diagnostic when one has a candidate exotic baryon, such as was the Θ^+.[5,9]

But it is also useful in identifying SU(3) partners of nonexotic resonances. For example, the $N(1535)$ should have strange partners[10] that are also η-philic; and in fact, there exists the S_{01} state $\Lambda(1670)$ that lies only 5 MeV above the $\eta\Lambda$ threshold (the phase space for $\pi\Sigma$ is 6 times larger), and yet its branching ratio to this channel is 10–25%. Other convincing examples[10] following the large N_c reasoning populate the sector of Λ and Σ resonances, but in many cases the uncertainty on branching ratios, or even the existence of the resonances themselves, is questionable. For example, large N_c makes definite statements about the spectroscopy and decays of Ξ and Ω resonances as well, but too little is known about them experimentally to make definitive comparisons.

As noted in the previous section, the familiar quark model multiplets at large N_c such as the SU(6)×O(3) ("**70**",1^-) actually form collections of distinct irreducible multiplets in large N_c. In the case just mentioned, one finds 5 such multiplets, labeled by $K=0,\frac{1}{2},1,\frac{3}{2},2$, whose masses can differ at $O(N_c^0)$. Those with $K=0,1,2$ define the multiplets with nonstrange members (*e.g.*, "**8**", "**10**"), while those with $K=\frac{1}{2},\frac{3}{2}$ define multiplets whose states of maximal hypercharge have a strange quark (*e.g.*, "**1**").

An unexpected result arises in the SU(3) group theory, in the form a a theorem restricting which meson-baryon states have leading-order [$O(N_c^0)$, by unitarity] CGC.[9,10] One can prove that SU(3) CGC for *baryon*$_1$ + *meson* $\leftrightarrow$ *baryon*$_2$ can be $O(N_c^0)$ only if $Y_{\rm meson}=Y_{B_2,\,\rm max}-Y_{B_1,\,\rm max}$, which is to say that the meson must have a hypercharge equal to the difference of the tops of the two baryon representations. In particular, the dominant two-body

decay mode of a Λ resonance in an "**8**" is predicted to be $\pi\,\Sigma(1192)$, while one in a "**1**" prefers $\overline{K}N$. Evidence for this remarkable result appears in, *e.g.*, $\Lambda(1520)$ D_{03}, where the coupling constant to $\overline{K}N$, once the threshold $p^{2L+1} \to p^5$ factor is taken into account, is 4–5 $[= O(N_c^1)]$ times larger than that for $\pi\Sigma$. Indeed, the SU(3) content of $\Lambda(1520)$ is traditionally assigned to be dominantly singlet.

The SU(3) theorem is also the key ingredient in the proof that the $I_t = J_t$ rule holds for three-flavor as well as two-flavor processes, and moreover that processes with strangeness exchange are suppressed (the $Y_t = 0$ rule).[11] This result predicts, for example, that the process $K^- p \to \pi^+ \Sigma^-$ is suppressed in cross section by $1/N_c$ compared to $K^- p \to K^- p$.

Decoupling Spurious States. Since, as noted, large N_c baryons inhabit much larger SU(3) representations and also allow much higher spins than for $N_c = 3$, most of these states must be $N_c > 3$ artifacts and need to be decoupled from the theory as spurious if they appear in amplitudes for physical $N_c = 3$ processes. The effects of such states must disappear smoothly and exactly at the value of N_c where they become spurious.[12] It would be extremely coincidental for such decoupling to occur through cancellation among dynamical quantities, which depend sensitively upon nonperturbative effects, not least of which are the precise values of quark masses. We therefore argue[12] that the only sources of true decoupling are group-theoretical in nature, either because the states of interest have isospin or strangeness values too high to reach in conventional $N_c = 3$ meson-baryon scattering, or lie in states in SU(3) multiplets that decouple when $N_c = 3$. Such decoupling appears through factors of $1 - 3/N_c$, a very special type of $1/N_c$ correction. For example, for $N_c > 3$ the "**1**" contains states with Ξ quantum numbers, and the SU(3) coupling for $\overline{K}\Sigma$ to this state indeed contains a factor of $\sqrt{1-3/N_c}$.

Interplay of Chiral and Large N_c Limits. Since meson-baryon scattering at threshold has also been studied in the context of another well-known expansion of strong interaction physics, the chiral expansion, it is natural to ask how the chiral and large N_c limits cooperate and compete.[13] The large N_c counting constraints for scattering amplitudes formally hold at all energies, while the chiral results become increasingly better the closer one approaches threshold. Among these results are the famed Weinberg-Tomozawa relation (between $I = 0, 2$ πN scattering lengths). Other well-known results relevant to the chiral π in meson-baryon scattering are the Adler-Weisberger

(AW) and Goldberger-Oehme-Miyazawa (GMO) cross section sum rules.

From the point of view of the $1/N_c$ expansion, scattering lengths are simply the derivatives of scattering amplitudes at zero meson energy. One finds that the combination corresponding to the WT and other chiral-limit relations are $O(N_c^0)$ but very well satisfied experimentally (as expected for threshold results), while most combinations that are $O(1/N_c)$ are not as well satisfied, but still have magnitudes consistent with the naive counting [that is, a dimensionless $O(1/N_c)$ combination is not larger than, say, 2/3].

The AW and GMO sum rules are not chiral limit results (They sum over all allowed energies), but nevertheless refer to chiral π's. In these cases one encounters the effect of the noncommutativity of the two limits: In particular, both fail if the large N_c limit is taken prior to the chiral limit, a consequence of the fact that the Δ-N mass difference is $O(1/N_c)$ and therefore falls below m_π for sufficiently large N_c. In that case the Δ becomes stable and must be treated on the same footing as the N.

4. Conclusions

The $1/N_c$ expansion provides a formalism in which to analyze meson-baryon scattering processes, including their rich spectrum of embedded resonances. The resonances appear in multiplets that bear a similarity to, but are more fundamental than, the old SU(6)×O(3) quark model multiplets. These multiplets have distinct dominant decay channels, it e.g., by preferring $\overline{K}N$ over $\pi\Lambda$ or $\pi\Sigma$. They are constrained by preferring $I_t = J_t$, $Y_t = 0$ processes. The problem of removing spurious ($N_c > 3$) states from the theory has been solved, and the nature of the interplay between the chiral and large N_c limits in meson-baryon scattering has been explored.

A number of interesting formal and phenomenological issues remain to be resolved. For example, all results presented here hold for single-meson scattering; of course, constraints also occur for scattering with, *e.g.*, $\pi\pi N$ final states, but these are as yet unexplored. Moreover, the three-flavor scattering results presented thus far only scratch the surface of the detailed phenomenological analysis that is now possible. A reliable means now exists to shed light on one of the darker corners of particle physics.

Acknowledgments

I thank the organizers for their kind invitation to this interesting and productive meeting. This work was supported in part by the NSF under Grants No. PHY-0140362 and PHY-0456520.

References

1. Particle Data Group (W.-M. Yao *et al.*), it J. Phys. G **33**, 1 (2006).
2. T.D. Cohen and R.F. Lebed, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 012001 (2003); *Phys. Rev.* D **67**, 012001 (2003).
3. T.D. Cohen and R.F. Lebed, *Phys. Rev.* D **68**, 056003 (2003).
4. T.D. Cohen, D.C. Dakin, A. Nellore, and R.F. Lebed, *Phys. Rev.* D **69**, 056001 (2004).
5. T.D. Cohen and R.F. Lebed, *Phys. Lett.* B **578**, 150 (2004).
6. T.D. Cohen, D.C. Dakin, A. Nellore, and R.F. Lebed, *Phys. Rev.* D **70**, 056004 (2004).
7. T.D. Cohen and R.F. Lebed, *Phys. Rev.* D **70**, 096015 (2004).
8. T.D. Cohen, D.C. Dakin, R.F. Lebed, and D.R. Martin, *Phys. Rev.* D **71**, 076010 (2005).
9. T.D. Cohen and R.F. Lebed, *Phys. Lett.* B **619**, 115 (2005).
10. T.D. Cohen and R.F. Lebed, *Phys. Rev.* D **72**, 056001 (2005).
11. R.F. Lebed, *Phys. Lett.* B **639**, 68 (2006).
12. T.D. Cohen and R.F. Lebed, *Phys. Rev.* D **74**, 036001 (2006).
13. T.D. Cohen and R.F. Lebed, `hep-ph/0608038` (accepted for publication in *Phys. Rev.* D).
14. R.F. Lebed, *Czech. J. Phys.* **49**, 1273 (1999) [nucl-th/9810080].
15. R.F. Lebed, `hep-ph/0406236`, published in *Continuous Advances in QCD 2004*, edited by T. Gherghetta, World Scientific, Singapore, 2004.
16. R.F. Lebed, `hep-ph/0601022`, published in *NStar 2005*, edited by S. Capstick *et al.*, World Scientific, Singapore (2006); `hep-ph/0509020`, published in *Proceedings of the International Conference on QCD and Hadronic Physics*, edited by K.-T. Chao *et al.*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* A **21**, 877; `hep-ph/0501021`, published in *Large N_c QCD 2004*, edited by J.L. Goity *et al.*, World Scientific, Hackensack, NJ, USA (2005); T.D. Cohen, `hep-ph/0501090`, published in *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Structure of Baryons*, edited by M. Guidal *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys.* A **755**, 40 (2005).
17. E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B223**, 433 (1983); G.S. Adkins, C.R. Nappi, and E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B228**, 552 (1983); G.S. Adkins and C.R. Nappi, *Nucl. Phys.* **B249**, 507 (1985).
18. A. Hayashi, G. Eckart, G. Holzwarth, H. Walliser, *Phys. Lett.* B **147**, 5 (1984).
19. M.P. Mattis and M. Karliner, *Phys. Rev.* D **31**, 2833 (1985); M.P. Mattis and M.E. Peskin, *Phys. Rev.* D **32**, 58 (1985); M.P. Mattis, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 1103 (1986); *Phys. Rev.* D **39**, 994 (1989); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 1455 (1989); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 1103 (1986).
20. J.T. Donohue, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58**, 3 (1987); *Phys. Rev.* D **37**, 631 (1988).
21. M.P. Mattis and M. Mukerjee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 1344 (1988).
22. R.F. Dashen and A.V. Manohar, *Phys. Lett.* B **315**, 425 (1993); R.F. Dashen, E. Jenkins, and A.V. Manohar, *Phys. Rev.* D **49**, 4713 (1994).
23. D.B. Kaplan and M.J. Savage, *Phys. Lett.* B **365**, 244 (1996); D.B. Kaplan and A.V. Manohar, *Phys. Rev.* C **56**, 76 (1997).
24. E. Jenkins, X. Ji, and A.V. Manohar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 242001 (2002).